

**TWIN CITIES AREA SURVEY AND LOW INCOME SURVEY 1984**

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING**

March 29, 1985

Prepared by: Rossana Armson

for

Minnesota Center for Social Research  
University of Minnesota  
2122 Riverside Avenue  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55454  
(612)-373-0150

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Executive Summary on Housing . . . . .	i
Introduction . . . . .	1
Background	
Objectives	
Housing Characteristics. . . . .	2
Housing Type and Home Ownership	
Housing Cost	
Housing Condition	
Adequacy of Housing Size	
Housing Assistance . . . . .	4
Government Financial Assistance	
Housing Assistance Program Utilization	
Need for Housing Assistance	
Neighborhood Quality . . . . .	6
Migration Patterns: Past and Projected. . . . .	7
Mobility	
Desired Housing Location	
Conclusion . . . . .	9
Appendices	
Appendix A: Methodology. . . . .	10
Appendix B: Percentaged Responses to Questions .	11
Appendix C: TC - TCAS'84 tables . . . . .	17
Appendix C: LI - LIS'84 tables. . . . .	26

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ON HOUSING

The results in this report are based on the 1984 Twin Cities Area Survey and the Low Income Survey. The primary objective of the series of questions on housing and community development was to determine the needs and problems of Twin Cities households, particularly low income households.

### Housing Characteristics

The average amount paid for a house payment or for rent was significantly lower for low income households than for the general population. However, low income households were much more overburdened by high housing costs than the general population; one-third of the low income households spent over 30% of their annual household income on housing. The low income households that were most likely to be overburdened by housing costs were renters and households with children.

Overall, people considered the condition of their homes to be good or very good. Those who considered the condition of their home to be poor or very poor were asked what kinds of things needed to be done to improve the condition of their home; the most frequent responses were energy-related improvements. About one out of every five renters reported that their landlord did not generally repair things that needed fixing in their housing unit.

Most people felt that their present residence was about the right size for their household. In addition to this subjective measure of adequacy, an objective measure of crowding indicated that few households had more than two persons per bedroom. However, low income households with children were more likely than households without children to be both subjectively and objectively crowded.

### Housing Assistance

Utilization of programs, such as subsidized housing, rent assistance, emergency shelters, and energy assistance, was quite low for the general population. Utilization levels were much higher for low income households, since most of these programs do have income restrictions. Energy assistance programs in particular appear to have been successful in reaching their targeted low income households. Of the low income households that had trouble finding enough money for basic utilities, nearly half had received energy assistance funds.

Economic necessity influenced living arrangements for a substantial portion of the metropolitan population, and the cost of housing was an even more pervasive problem. One of the most alarming indications of need occurs in the allocation of household funds between housing and other necessities. One-third of the low income households had to do without other necessities in order to pay their housing costs.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ON HOUSING

### Neighborhood Quality

Most people gave their neighborhood the highest possible rating as a place to live and thought that their neighborhood was a good place to raise children. However, low income residents of Minneapolis and St. Paul were more negative about their neighborhoods than those living in other parts of the Twin Cities area. For those who did not give their neighborhood the highest rating, public safety was mentioned most frequently as the item needing improvement to make their neighborhood a better place to live.

### Migration Patterns: Past and Projected

Residents of the Twin Cities metropolitan area tended to have relatively stable residential patterns, although low income households did tend to move more often. Most Twin Cities households had moved to their present residence from another location in the same city or town.

About half of the people surveyed said that they would prefer to live outside the neighborhood they live in now. Dissatisfaction with the current city of residence was much lower than dissatisfaction with neighborhoods.

### Conclusion

High housing costs were a serious problem for low income households in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, particularly for renters and households with children. These households were not only paying a large portion of their annual income on housing, but a substantial portion of all low income households had to do without other necessities in order to pay their housing costs. Clearly, existing housing assistance programs are not reaching these households; any proposed housing programs should include these groups in their target populations. The related issues of overcrowding and poor housing conditions did not appear to be problematic for any substantial portion of households in the metropolitan area.

A great deal of dissatisfaction was expressed about neighborhood quality, especially for Minneapolis and St. Paul neighborhoods. Residents felt that public safety in particular needed to be improved to make their neighborhoods better places to live. This locational dissatisfaction has numerous implications for those areas of the city that people would like to leave. If this dissatisfaction were translated into out-migration, the composition and tax base of the affected areas would change substantially. Local governments appear to have extensive work to do in improving the conditions in certain parts of the metropolitan area.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

### Introduction

#### Background

The results in this report are based on the 1984 Twin Cities Area Survey (TCAS'84) and the Low Income Survey (LIS'84). A short summary of these surveys and their methodology appears in Appendix A. The actual questions on housing and community development and the corresponding household percentages are included as Appendix B of this report. All percentages reported here are household percentages, since housing information is most appropriate when reported at the household level. In referring to Appendix B, care must be taken to distinguish between percentages of the total sample and percentages of a portion of the sample, since not all questions were asked of each respondent. Finally, tables which are discussed in the report appear in Appendix C; Appendix C: TC contains the TCAS'84 tables and Appendix C: LI contains the LIS'84 tables. Analyses which were done but showed no significant results are not presented here, but these tables are available on request.

Further details may be found in the MCSR Technical Report 85-1, Codebook and Methods of the 1984 Twin Cities Area Survey. However, that publication contains the percentage of individuals responding to each question in each survey, and it should be noted that household and individual percentages are not interchangeable.

#### Objectives

The primary objective of the series of questions on housing and community development was to determine the needs and problems of Twin Cities households, particularly the low income households. Following a description of current housing type and ownership, the principal topics were housing cost, housing condition, the adequacy of housing size, housing program utilization and unmet need, neighborhood quality, and mobility.

This portion of the public policy section of TCAS'84 was developed with the assistance of a group of local government and private organization staff persons who are actively working in the housing area. The group had a high level of technical knowledge about the area, and developed the topics and questions for the survey in order to gather information which would help them with their immediate programmatic and planning needs.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

### Housing Characteristics

#### Housing Type and Home Ownership (Questions B1, B2)

The most common type of housing unit occupied by Twin City residents was the owner-occupied single family home, while low income households were much more likely to be renting their dwelling. Home ownership was less frequent in Minneapolis than in St. Paul or the suburbs, and was most atypical for low income households located in Minneapolis.

TCAS'84. About three-quarters (70%) of the TCAS general population sample reported living in single family homes; only 16% were apartment dwellers. A similar percentage (74%) of the general population owned their own homes. Suburban and St. Paul residents were more likely to be homeowners than residents of Minneapolis. While 83% of the households outside Minneapolis and St. Paul were occupied by homeowners, 67% of the St. Paul households and only 56% of the Minneapolis households were occupied by owners (Table TC-1).

LIS'84. Low income households were about equally likely to live in single family homes (37%) and in apartments (40%), with an additional 11% that lived in duplexes. Only 36% of these households owned their own homes. Again, low income households located in Minneapolis (23%) and St. Paul (37%) were less likely to own their own homes than was true for households in other parts of the metropolitan area (55%; Table LI-1).

#### Housing Cost (Questions B2a, B2b, B2d, B6)

The average amount paid for a house payment or for rent was significantly lower for low income households than for the general population. However, low income households were much more overburdened by high housing costs than the general population; one-third of the low income households spent over 30% of their annual household income on housing. The low income households that were most likely to be overburdened by housing costs were renters and households with children.

TCAS'84. Overall, households in the Twin Cities metropolitan area pay an average of about \$350 each month for housing. The monthly payment for owners and renters was essentially the same: about \$350 each month (Table TC-11). About two-thirds of the homeowners currently making payments on their homes had insurance (61%) and taxes (62%) included in their monthly house payment, and about two-thirds of the renters paid heat as part of their rental payment (65%).

Only 11% of these households pay more than 30% of their annual household income on housing. The households that are most likely to be overburdened by housing costs are renters (25% for renters compared to 5% for owners; Table TC-2).

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

LIS'84. Low income households in the Twin Cities area pay an average of about \$230 each month for housing. However, the average monthly rental payment is substantially higher than the average monthly house payment. The average rent payment was \$275 while the average house payment was \$160 (Table LI-15), because nearly half the low-income homeowners were no longer making any house payments. Again, about two-thirds of the homeowners currently making house payments had insurance (60%) and taxes (64%) included in their monthly payment. Seventy percent of the renters paid heat as part of their rent.

Thirty-six percent of the low income households in the metropolitan area pay more than 30% of their annual household income on house payments or rent. The low income households that were most likely to be overburdened by housing costs were renters and households with children. Nearly half (46%) of the low income renters paid over 30% of their household income on housing, compared to only 18% of the homeowners (Table LI-2). Similarly, nearly half (46%) of the households with children were overburdened by high housing costs compared to 32% of the households without children (Table LI-3).

### Housing Condition (Questions B2e, B3)

Overall, people considered the condition of their homes to be good or very good. Those who considered the condition of their home to be poor or very poor were asked what kinds of things needed to be done to improve the condition of their home; the most frequent responses were energy-related improvements.

The reported condition of occupied rental housing was essentially the same for both TCAS and LIS; about one out of every five renters reported that their landlord did not generally repair things that needed fixing in their housing unit.

TCAS'84. The vast majority of Twin City residents rated the condition of their homes as very good (45%) or good (51%). For the 4% who rated the condition of their homes as poor or very poor, the most frequently mentioned types of improvements were cosmetic, energy related, and other improvements. For individuals who mentioned more than one type of improvement, energy related improvements were cited as the most important improvement that was needed. Of all renters in the general population, 19% reported that their landlord did not generally repair things that needed fixing in their housing unit.

LIS'84. Most low income residents also considered the condition of their homes to be very good (31%) or good (59%). For the 10% who rated the condition of their homes as poor or very poor, the most frequently mentioned improvement was energy related items such as insulation. Of all low income renters, 17% reported that their landlord did not generally repair things that needed fixing in their housing unit.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

### Adequacy of Housing Size (Questions B4, B5)

Most people felt that their present residence was about the right size for their household. In addition to this subjective measure of adequacy, an objective measure of crowding indicated that few households had more than two persons per bedroom. However, low income households with children were more likely than households without children to be both subjectively and objectively crowded.

TCAS'84. Three-quarters of the general population said their housing unit was about the right size for their household. Only 13% of the TCAS households reported that their housing unit was too small. Finally, only 2% of the metropolitan area households were crowded, where crowding was defined as occupancy exceeding two persons per bedroom.

LIS'84. Three-quarters of the low income households said their housing unit was about the right size for their household. Only 16% of these households reported that their housing unit was too small. Finally, only 4% of the low income households were crowded, where crowding was defined as occupancy exceeding two persons per bedroom. Low income households with children were more likely than households without children to be perceived as crowded (26% compared to 12%; Table LI-4) and to have more than two persons per bedroom (Table LI-5).

### Housing Assistance

#### Government Financial Assistance (Questions B2c,B2cl)

Relatively few homeowners in the Twin Cities have ever received a low interest government loan or grant to fix up or buy the house they live in now.

TCAS'84. Only 14% of the homeowners included in the TCAS sample had received financial assistance from the government to fix up or buy their current home. Homeowners in Minneapolis and St. Paul (22%) were much more likely to have been the recipients of this government assistance than residents of other areas (10%; Table TC-3). The specific form of this financial assistance was most frequently reported to be categorized as "other". This category included such sources as FHA and VA loans, and the GI bill.

LIS'84. Twenty-two percent of the low income homeowners had received financial assistance from the government to fix up or buy their current home. Low income households in Minneapolis and St. Paul were more likely to have received this assistance than low income households in other parts of the metropolitan area (26% compared to 16%; Table LI-6). Again, the specific form of this financial assistance was most frequently reported to be categorized as "other", including such sources as FHA and VA loans, and the GI bill.



## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

### Housing Assistance Program Utilization (Questions B8, B11, B13)

Utilization of programs, such as subsidized housing, rent assistance, emergency shelters, and energy assistance, was quite low for the general population. Utilization levels were much higher for low income households, since most of these programs do have income restrictions. Energy assistance programs in particular appear to have been successful in reaching their targeted low income households. Of the low income households that had trouble finding enough money for basic utilities, nearly half had received energy assistance funds.

TCAS'84. Only 4% of the households in the metropolitan area were living in subsidized housing or receiving rent assistance; and emergency housing has only been needed by 1% of these households in the last year. Of the households that had trouble finding enough money for basic utilities, only 21% received energy assistance; this was probably because of income eligibility requirements for the programs. Of the households that did receive energy assistance, those located in Minneapolis and St. Paul were more likely to receive energy assistance than those located in other areas (25% compared to 12%; Table TC-4).

LIS'84. Twenty-two percent of the low income households were either living in subsidized housing or receiving rent assistance. The low income households that were receiving rent assistance or living in subsidized housing were more likely to be located in Minneapolis and St. Paul than in other areas (25% compared to 15%; Table LI-7). Emergency housing has been needed by few low income households (4%) in the past year, but 25% of the households that did need it have stayed overnight in a shelter. Of the low income households that had trouble finding enough money for basic utilities, nearly half (43%) had received energy assistance funds.

### Need for Housing Assistance (Questions B7, B9, B10, B12)

The level of need for assistance was addressed by questions on shared living arrangements, problems in finding adequate housing, the allocation of household resources between housing costs and other necessities, and expectations of future problems paying for housing and heating costs. Economic necessity influenced living arrangements for a substantial portion of the metropolitan population, and the cost of housing was an even more pervasive problem. One of the most alarming indications of need occurs in the allocation of household funds between housing and other necessities. One-third of the low income households had to do without other necessities in order to pay their housing costs.

TCAS'84. Ten percent of the general population were sharing housing with someone because they had to in order to afford it, and about half (42%) of the people who looked for housing in the past year had a problem finding adequate housing that they could afford. Few households expected to have problems paying for housing (4%) or utility bills (5%) next year. Twenty-one percent of the general population have had to do without other necessities in order to pay their housing costs. Of these people with allocation difficulties, 29% had this situation happen very often or pretty often.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

LIS'84. Eighteen percent of the low income sample were sharing housing with someone because they had to in order to afford it, and about half (62%) of the people who looked for housing in the past year had a problem finding adequate housing that they could afford. A substantial number of low income households expected to have problems next year paying for housing (11%) and utility bills (19%). Finally, about a third (34%) of the low income households had to do without other necessities in order to pay their housing costs; and half (50%) of these households had this happen very often or pretty often.

### Neighborhood Quality

#### Neighborhood Quality (Questions B15, B16, B17)

Most people gave their neighborhood the highest possible rating as a place to live and thought that their neighborhood was a good place to raise children. However, low income residents of Minneapolis and St. Paul were more negative about their neighborhoods than those living in other parts of the Twin Cities area. For those who did not give their neighborhood the highest rating, and for low income households in Minneapolis and St. Paul, public safety was mentioned most frequently as the item needing improvement to make their neighborhood a better place to live.

TCAS'84. Eighty-one percent of the general population rated their neighborhood as "good" and a similar proportion thought that their neighborhood was a good place to raise children (84%). However, respondents whose households were located in Minneapolis and St. Paul were more likely to give a negative evaluation to their neighborhood. For example, 38% of those living in Minneapolis and St. Paul rated their neighborhood as "fair or poor", while only 8% of those living in other areas gave their neighborhood similar ratings (Table TC-5). Similarly, 30% of those living in Minneapolis and St. Paul felt their neighborhood was not a good place to raise children, but only 7% of those living outside the two central cities considered their neighborhood to be a bad place to raise children.

When asked about how to make their neighborhood a better place to live, the most common response was that nothing needed attention (categorized as "something else"). However, those who rated their neighborhood as "fair or poor" were less likely to say that nothing needed improvement (23% compared to 37%) and more likely to respond that appearance (20% compared to 8%) or public safety (24% compared to 15%) needed to be improved to make their neighborhood a better place to live (Table TC-7).

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

LIS'84. About two-thirds of the respondents from low income households rated their neighborhood as "good" (64%) and thought that their it was a good place to raise children (65%). Again, respondents whose households were located in Minneapolis and St. Paul were more likely to give a negative evaluation to their neighborhood. Forty-six percent of those living in Minneapolis and St. Paul rated their neighborhood as "fair or poor", while only 18% of those living in other areas gave their neighborhood similar ratings (Table LI-8). Minneapolis and St. Paul residents were also more likely than those in other areas to feel that their neighborhood was not a good place to raise children (42% compared to 15%; Table LI-9).

When asked how to make their neighborhood a better place to live, the most common response was again that "something else", frequently "nothing", was the item that needed the most attention. However, those who rated their neighborhood as "fair or poor" were less likely to say that nothing needed improvement (27% compared to 41%) and more likely to respond that public safety (30% compared to 15%) needed to be improved to make their neighborhood a better place to live (Table LI-10). Low income households in Minneapolis and St. Paul were much more likely than low income households in other parts of the metropolitan area to mention public safety as the most needed improvement for their neighborhood (26% compared to 8%; Table LI-11).

### Migration Patterns: Past and Projected

#### Mobility (Questions B19, B20, B21, B21a, B22)

Residents in the Twin Cities metropolitan area tended to have relatively stable residential patterns, although low income households did tend to move more often. Most Twin Cities households had moved to their present residence from another location in the same city or town.

TCAS'84. The average occupancy in a household's current residence was about 10 years (Table TC-12) and the average time in the current city or town was about 21 years (Table TC-13). Only 21% of the Twin Cities households had moved within the last two years. The most frequently occurring reason for the last move was that the household "needed more room" or they "bought (their) own place".

Most Twin Cities residents had moved to their present residence from another location in the same city or town (49%). This was particularly true for households in Minneapolis and St. Paul (80% compared to 41% for other parts of the metropolitan area; Table TC-10). Eighteen percent had made their last move from somewhere in the same neighborhood, and relatively few households had moved to their current residence from some other state (11%).

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

LIS'84. The average occupancy in a low income household's current residence was about 10 years (Table LI-16) and the average time in the current city or town was about 25 years (Table LI-17). Thirty-six percent of the low income households have moved at least once in the last two years, and 9% have moved more than twice. The most frequent reasons for a low income household's last move were "rent increase/finances" and "needed more room".

Most low income households had moved to their present residence from another location in the same city or town (65%); this was even more likely to be the case for Minneapolis and St. Paul residents (84%) than for those in other parts of the metropolitan area (50%; Table LI-14). About one-quarter (26%) of the low income households had made their last move from somewhere in the same neighborhood, and only 9% had moved to their current residence from some other state.

### Desired Housing Location (Questions B18, B23, B24)

When asked "If you were to move to some other housing you could afford, would you prefer to live in the same neighborhood you do now, in a different neighborhood in the same city, or in some other city?", about half of the people surveyed said that they would prefer to live outside the neighborhood they live in now. Dissatisfaction with the current city of residence was not nearly as great as dissatisfaction with neighborhoods.

TCAS'84. Forty-five percent of the households currently located in the metropolitan area have residents who would prefer to live outside the neighborhood they live in now. Residents of Minneapolis and St. Paul were less likely to want to remain in their current neighborhood than those who live in other parts of the metropolitan area (50% compared to 60%; Table TC-8).

Only one out of every five individuals responded that they would prefer to live in some other city (18%). In addition, responses to another question on city preference indicate that 72% of those who live in Minneapolis prefer to remain there, with 63% of St. Paul respondents and 93% of suburban respondents also expressing a preference to remain in St. Paul and the suburbs, respectively (Table TC-9). The greatest desire for change appears for Minneapolis and St. Paul residents who would prefer to live in the suburbs (26% of Minneapolis residents, 28% of St. Paul residents).

LIS'84. Forty-eight percent of the low income households currently located in the metropolitan area have residents who would prefer to live outside the neighborhood they live in now. Low income residents of Minneapolis and St. Paul were less likely to want to remain in their current neighborhood than those who live in other parts of the metropolitan area (45% compared to 59%; Table LI-12).

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

Only one out of every five low income individuals responded that they would prefer to live in some other city (17%). Based on another question on city preference, 71% of those who live in Minneapolis and 68% of those who live in St. Paul would prefer to remain in their present city, while 86% of the suburban residents would prefer to remain in the suburbs (Table LI-13). Only about one quarter of those currently residing in Minneapolis and St. Paul would prefer to live in the suburbs if they could afford it (28% and 24%, respectively). A sizeable, but smaller, proportion of suburban residents would prefer to live in Minneapolis or St. Paul (14%).

### Conclusion

High housing costs were a serious problem for low income households in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, particularly for renters and households with children. These households were not only paying a large portion of their annual income on housing, but a substantial portion of all low income households had to do without other necessities in order to pay their housing costs. Clearly, existing housing assistance programs are not reaching these households; any proposed housing programs should include these groups in their target populations. The related issues of overcrowding and poor housing conditions did not appear to be problematic for any substantial portion of households in the metropolitan area.

A great deal of dissatisfaction was expressed about neighborhood quality, especially for Minneapolis and St. Paul neighborhoods. Residents felt that public safety in particular needed to be improved to make their neighborhoods better places to live. This locational dissatisfaction has numerous implications for those areas of the city that people would like to leave. If this dissatisfaction were translated into out-migration, the composition and tax base of the affected areas would change substantially. Local governments appear to have extensive work to do in improving the conditions in certain parts of the metropolitan area.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

### APPENDIX A: METHODOLOGY

#### A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE TCAS'84 AND LIS'84 METHODOLOGY

##### Twin Cities Area Survey (TCAS'84)

The 1984 Twin Cities Area Survey (TCAS'84) was an omnibus survey of adults age 18 and over, who reside in the seven county Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan area. TCAS'84 was conducted October through December 1984 by the Minnesota Center for Social Research (MCSR), a research unit within the Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota. The survey consisted primarily of telephone interviews, which were supplemented by field interviews for households that could not be reached by telephone.

##### Low Income Survey (LIS'84)

TCAS'84 was complemented by a special survey of 974 low income persons which was called the Low Income Survey (LIS). LIS contained identical questions to TCAS'84 on most topics, including housing, human services, economy and employment, and energy and environment. The Low Income Survey respondents were persons with household incomes below certain levels that were established by household size. For example, a household of four members had to have an annual 1983 income that was below \$17,000 to be eligible for inclusion in the Low Income Survey.

##### Sampling Design

Selection of respondents occurred in two stages: first a household in the Twin Cities seven county metropolitan area was randomly selected; then a person was randomly selected for interviewing from within the household. These sampling procedures guaranteed that every household in the Twin Cities area had an equal chance to be included in the survey, and that once the household was sampled, every adult had an equal chance of being selected. The TCAS sample had two components: the panel (persons who had been interviewed in the preceding year and who had agreed to be interviewed again) and the panel replacements (persons selected at random from the seven county population). The Low Income Survey consisted of persons screened for income eligibility from a general random sample of over 6,000 households.

##### Sampling Error

The margin of error for a simple random sample of the size of the Twin Cities Area Survey may be as high as plus or minus three percent, depending on the distribution of sample responses. This sampling error presumes the conventional 95% degree of desired confidence, which is equivalent to a "significance level" of .05.

The importance of sample size in estimating sampling error also needs to be mentioned, since many of the organizations using the TCAS'84 and LIS'84 data will be interested in subgroups, rather than the total sample of 1,000 completed interviews. Essentially, as the size of the sample decreases, there is a corresponding increase in the estimated sampling error. For example, for a subset of 200 persons the estimated error may be as high as plus or minus seven percent.

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

## APPENDIX B: PERCENTAGED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

Only household percentages are reported in this appendix. In contrast, the publication Codebook and Methods of the 1984 Twin Cities Area Survey contains percentages that indicate the number in individuals responding in each answer category. The percentages for households and individuals are not interchangeable.

### B. HOUSING

Now I have some questions on housing.

		TC%	LI%
B1.	What kind of housing unit do you live in ... a single family house, a townhouse, an apartment, or something else?		
	Single family house . . .01	70	37
	Townhouse . . . . .02	3	3
	Apartment . . . . .03	16	40
	Mobile home . . . . .04	1	2
	Duplex. . . . .05	6	11
	4-plex. . . . .06	0	1
	Condominium . . . . .07	1	1
	Rooming House . . . . .08	0	1
	No regular residence. .09	0	0
	Other (SPECIFY). . .10	2	3
B2.	Do you or some member of your household own your home or are you renting?	TC% 74	LI% 36
	Own. . . . . 1		
	Rent . . . . . 2	26	64
	(IF RENT, GO TO B2d)		
B2a.	(IF OWN) Does your house payment include insurance?	TC% 37	LI% 13
	Yes. . . . . 1		
	No . . . . . 2	23	8
	No house payment . 3	13	15
	DK . . . . 8	1	0
	NA . . . . 0	26	64
B2b.	(IF OWN) Does it include taxes?	TC% 38	LI% 14
	Yes. . . . . 1		
	No . . . . . 2	23	8
	No house payment . 3	13	14
	DK . . . . 8	1	1
	NA . . . . 0	26	64
B2c.	(IF OWN) Did you ever receive a low-interest government loan or grant to fix up or buy the house you live in now?	TC% 10	LI% 8
	Yes. . . . . 1		
	No . . . . . 2	64	29
	(IF NO, GO TO B3)		
	NA . . . . 0	26	64
B2c1.	(IF YES) Was that a city or state-sponsored mortgage, a low-interest rehabilitation loan, a weatherization loan, or some other type?	TC% 0	LI% 1
	City sponsored mortgage. 1		
	State sponsored mortgage 2	1	1
	Low interest rehab. . . 3	1	1
	Weatherization loan . . 4	1	1
	Other (SPECIFY) . . . . 5	5	3
	NA . . . . 0	90	92
	(IF OWN, GO TO B3)		

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

B2d. (IF RENT) Does your rent payment include heat?	Yes. . . . .	1	TC%	LI%			
	No . . . . .	2	17	45			
	NA . . . . .	0	8	18			
			74	36			
B2e. (IF RENT) Does your landlord generally repair things that need fixing in your housing unit?	Yes. . . . .	1	TC%	LI%			
	No . . . . .	2	20	52			
	DK . . . . .	8	5	11			
	NA . . . . .	0	0	1			
			74	37			
B3. Overall, is the condition of your home very good, good, poor, or very poor?	Very good. . . . .	1	TC%	LI%			
	Good . . . . .	2	45	31			
	(IF VERY GOOD OR GOOD, GO TO B4)		51	59			
	Poor . . . . .	3	4	9			
	Very poor. . . . .	4	0	1			
B3a. (IF POOR OR VERY POOR) What kinds of things need to be done to improve the condition of your home? (DO NOT READ LIST, PROBE FOR 3.)							
	Yes	No	DK	RA	NA	ROW	TOTAL
	1	2	8	9	0		
B3a1 Broken windows . . . . .	0	4	0	0	96	100%	TC
	1	9	0	0	90	100%	LI
B3a2 Cosmetic (carpet, paint) . . . . .	2	2	0	0	96	100%	TC
	4	6	0	0	90	100%	LI
B3a3 Energy related(insulation) . . . . .	2	2	0	0	96	100%	TC
	5	5	0	0	90	100%	LI
B3a4 Kitchen and bath . . . . .	0	4	0	0	96	100%	TC
	1	9	0	0	90	100%	LI
B3a5 Plumbing . . . . .	1	2	0	0	96	100%	TC
	3	7	0	0	90	100%	LI
B3a6 Porches, walks, and steps. . . . .	0	4	0	0	96	100%	TC
	1	9	0	0	90	100%	LI
B3a7 Roof . . . . .	1	3	0	0	96	100%	TC
	2	8	0	0	90	100%	LI
B3a8 Sanitation (rats, roaches) . . . . .	0	4	0	0	96	100%	TC
	2	8	0	0	90	100%	LI
B3a9 Security (deadbolt locks, smoke alarms). . . . .	0	4	0	0	96	100%	TC
	0	9	0	0	90	100%	LI
B3a10 Structural defects. . . . .	0	4	0	0	96	100%	TC
	2	8	0	0	90	100%	LI
B3a11 Wiring. . . . .	1	3	0	0	96	100%	TC
	2	8	0	0	90	100%	LI
B3a12 Nothing . . . . .	0	4	0	0	96	100%	TC
	0	9	0	0	90	100%	LI
	(IF NOTHING, GO TO B4)						
B3a15 Other (SPECIFY) . . . . .	2	2	0	0	96	100%	TC
	6	4	0	0	90	100%	LI

(IF MORE THAN ONE MENTION TO B3a, ASK B3b - B3d)

(IF ONLY ONE MENTION, GO TO B4)



# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

B3b. You mentioned (READ MENTION FROM ABOVE). Which of these would you say is the <u>most</u> improvement that is needed?	Cosmetic . . . . . 2	TC%	LI%
	Energy related . . . 3	0	1
	Plumbing . . . . . 5	1	2
	Roof . . . . . 7	0	1
	Structural . . . .10	0	1
	Other (SPECIFY) . .15	0	1
	NA . . . . . 0	96	91
B3c. Which one is the second most important?	Cosmetic . . . . . 2	TC%	LI%
	Energy related . . . 3	1	1
	Plumbing . . . . . 5	0	2
	Roof . . . . . 7	0	1
	Other (SPECIFY) . .15	1	0
	NA . . . . . 0	1	2
		96	92
B3d. Which one is the third most important?	Cosmetic . . . . . 2	TC%	LI%
	Wiring . . . . .11	0	1
	Other (SPECIFY) . .15	0	2
	NA . . . . . 0	98	94
B4. How many bedrooms are there in your housing unit, not including basement or porch areas?	1	TC%	LI%
	2	12	32
	3	27	35
	4	41	22
	5	15	7
	6	2	2
	NA . . . . . 0	1	0
B5. Is your housing unit too large, about right, or too small for your household?	Too large. . . . . 1	TC%	LI%
	About right. . . . . 2	12	7
	Too small. . . . . 3	75	76
		13	16
B6. How much does your household pay each month for a house payment or for rent?	\$		
	DK . .8888		See App. A
	RA . .9999		for results on B6.
B7. Are you sharing housing with someone else because you have to in order to afford it?	Yes. . . . . 1	TC%	LI%
	No . . . . . 2	10	18
		89	82
B8. Are you living in subsidized housing or receiving rent assistance from a government program?	Yes. . . . . 1	TC%	LI%
	No . . . . . 2	4	22
	DK . . . . . 8	96	77
		0	1
B9. Have you ever had to do without other necessities in order to pay your housing costs?	Yes. . . . . 1	TC%	LI%
	No . . . . . 2	21	34
	(IF NO, GO TO B10)	79	66
B9a. (IF YES) How often does this happen ... very often, pretty often, or not very often?	Very often . . . . . 1	TC%	LI%
	Pretty often . . . . 2	2	8
	Not very often . . . 3	4	9
	NA . . . . . 0	14	17
		79	66

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

B10. Have you looked for housing in the past year?	Yes. . . . .	1	TC%	LI%
	No . . . . .	2	26	31
	(IF NO, GO TO B11)		74	69
B10a. (IF YES) In the last year, did you have a problem finding adequate housing that you could afford?	Yes. . . . .	1	TC%	LI%
	No . . . . .	2	11	19
	NA . . . . .	0	15	11
			74	69
B11. Did you need emergency housing in the last year?	Yes. . . . .	1	TC%	LI%
	No . . . . .	2	1	4
	(IF NO, GO TO B12)		99	96
B11a. (IF YES) Have you stayed overnight in one of the emergency shelters?	Yes. . . . .	1	TC%	LI%
	No . . . . .	2	0	1
	NA . . . . .	0	1	3
			99	96
B12. Do you expect to have any problem paying for housing next year?	Yes. . . . .	1	TC%	LI%
	No . . . . .	2	4	11
	DK . . . . .	8	93	80
			2	8
B13. Within the last year, have you had trouble finding enough money for basic utilities such as heat and electricity?	Yes. . . . .	1	TC%	LI%
	No . . . . .	2	14	30
			86	70
B13a. (IF YES) Did you receive energy assistance to pay your utility bills?	Yes. . . . .	1	TC%	LI%
	No . . . . .	2	3	13
	NA . . . . .	0	12	16
			86	70
B14. Next year, do you expect to need assistance to pay your utility bills?	Yes. . . . .	1	TC%	LI%
	No . . . . .	2	5	19
	DK . . . . .	8	93	73
			2	8
B15. What is your overall rating of your neighborhood as a place to live ... good, fair, poor, or very poor?	Good . . . . .	1	TC%	LI%
	Fair . . . . .	2	81	64
	Poor . . . . .	3	15	27
	Very poor. . . . .	4	3	7
			0	2
B16. What needs the most attention to make your neighborhood a better place to live ... neighborhood appearance, schools, noise, housing condition, street maintenance, public safety, or something else?	Neighborhood appearance . . . . .	1	TC%	LI%
	Schools. . . . .	2	10	9
	Noise. . . . .	3	5	2
	Housing condition. . . . .	4	15	13
	Street maintenance . . . . .	5	3	6
	Public safety. . . . .	6	14	10
	Else (SPECIFY) . . . . .	7	16	19
	DK . . . . .	8	34	34
			2	8
B17. Do you feel that the neighborhood you live in is a good place to raise children?	Yes. . . . .	1	TC%	LI%
	No . . . . .	2	84	65
	DK . . . . .	8	15	31
			0	4

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

B18. If you were to move to some other housing you could afford, would you prefer to live in the same neighborhood you live in now, in a different neighborhood in the same city, or in some other city?	Same neighborhood.	1	TC%	LI%
	Different.	2	55	48
	Some other city.	3	25	31
	DK	8	18	17
			2	3

B19. How long have you lived in the housing unit you live in now? (LIST LESS THAN ONE YEAR AS 01)	Less than 5 years.	1	TC%	LI%
	5 to 15 years.	2	38	51
	16 to 30 years	3	40	27
	More than 30 years	4	17	13
			5	9

B20. How long have you lived in the city or town you live in now? (LIST LESS THAN ONE YEAR AS 01)	Less than 5 years.	1	TC%	LI%
	5 to 15 years.	2	24	23
	16 to 30 years	3	28	21
	More than 30 years	4	26	22
			22	33

B21. How many times have you moved within the last two years?	None	0	TC%	LI%
	(IF 0, GO TO B22)		79	64
	Once	1	14	16
	Twice	2	4	9
	Three times	3	2	6
	Four times	4	0	2
	Five times	5	0	1

B21a. (IF MOVED AT LEAST ONCE) What was the reason for your last move?  
(DO NOT READ LIST, DO NOT PROBE, CODE ALL MENTIONS)

	Yes	No	DK	RA	NA	ROW	TOTAL
	1	2	8	9	0		
B21a1 More convenient location . . .	1	20	0	0	79	100%	TC
	2	32	0	0	66	100%	LI
B21a2 Rent increase/finances . . .	2	19	0	0	79	100%	TC
	5	29	0	0	66	100%	LI
B21a3 Needed more room . . .	3	18	0	0	79	100%	TC
	4	30	0	0	66	100%	LI
B21a4 Bought own place . . .	3	18	0	0	79	100%	TC
	1	33	0	0	66	100%	LI
B21a5 Better neighborhood. . .	1	20	0	0	79	100%	TC
	2	33	0	0	66	100%	LI
B21a6 Security/safety. . .	0	20	0	0	79	100%	TC
	1	34	0	0	66	100%	LI
B21a7 Utility problems . . .	0	21	0	0	79	100%	TC
	1	33	0	0	66	100%	LI
B21a8 Building redeveloped . . .	0	21	0	0	79	100%	TC
	0	34	0	0	66	100%	LI
B21a11 Other (SPECIFY) . . .	12	9	0	0	79	100%	TC
	23	12	0	0	66	100%	LI

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

B22. Now, I'd like to ask you about the last place you lived before you moved into the home you have now.

Before you moved, did you live in Minnesota or in some other state?

	TC%	LI%
Minnesota. . . . . 1	<u>88</u>	<u>90</u>
Some other state . 2	11	9
(IF OTHER, GO TO B23)		
Always lived in same home . . . . . 3	1	0
(IF ALWAYS SAME, GO TO B23)		

B22a. (IF MINNESOTA) Did you live in the same city or town you live in now?

	TC%	LI%
Yes. . . . . 1	<u>49</u>	<u>65</u>
No . . . . . 2	39	25
NA . . . . 0	12	10

B22a1 (IF YES) Did you live in the same neighborhood you live in now?

	TC%	LI%
Yes. . . . . 1	<u>18</u>	<u>26</u>
No . . . . . 2	32	41
NA . . . . 0	50	33

B22a2 (IF NO) What city or town did you live in before you moved the last time?

NUMBER:

Bloomington. . .0334
Brooklyn Park. .0404
Edina. . . . .0864
Minneapolis. . .1794
Richfield. . . .2364
St. Louis Park .2514
St. Paul . . . .2534
Other (SPECIFY).....

See App. A for results on B22a2.

B23. If you were to move to some other housing you could afford in the metro area, would you prefer to live in Minneapolis, in St. Paul, or in the suburbs?

	TC%	LI%
Minneapolis. . . . 1	<u>21</u>	<u>37</u>
St. Paul . . . . . 2	10	15
Suburbs. . . . . 3	68	46
DK . . . . . 8	1	3

B24. Why would you prefer to live there? (DO NOT READ LIST, PROBE FOR 2 RESPONSES)

See App. A for results on B24.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

### APPENDIX C: TC-TCAS'84 TABLES

#### DIRECTORY

	<u>PAGE</u>
FREQUENCIES	
H COST2 (% OF INCOME SPENT ON HOUSING) .	18
CROWDED (PERSONS PER BEDROOM) . . . . .	18
CROSSTABS	
Table TC-1 B2 by CITIES . . . . .	19
Table TC-2 H COST2 by B2 . . . . .	19
Table TC-3 B2C by MSP . . . . .	20
Table TC-4 B13A by MSP. . . . .	20
Table TC-5 B15 by MSP . . . . .	21
Table TC-6 B17 by MSP . . . . .	21
Table TC-7 B16 by B15 . . . . .	22
Table TC-8 B18 by MSP . . . . .	23
Table TC-9 B23 by CITIES. . . . .	23
Table TC-10 B22A by MSP . . . . .	24
BREAKDOWN	
Table TC-11 B6 by B2. . . . .	25
Table TC-12 B19 by B2 . . . . .	25
Table TC-13 B20 by B2 . . . . .	25

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

## - - - FREQUENCIES - - -

H COST2 PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME SPENT ON HOUSING

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
30 OR UNDER	1.	847	79.6	89.4	89.4
OVER 30	2.	100	9.4	10.6	100.0
	999.	117	11.0	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1064	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 947 MISSING CASES 117

CROWDED NUMBER OF PERSONS PER BEDROOM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LESS THAN 1	1.0	303	28.5	28.7	28.7
ONE	2.0	347	32.6	32.9	61.6
BETWEEN 1 & 2	3.0	384	36.1	36.4	98.0
MORE THAN 2	4.0	21	2.0	2.0	100.0
	9.0	9	.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1064	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 1055 MISSING CASES 9

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

## - - - CROSSTABS - - -

**TABLE TC-1. B2 OWN OR RENT HOUSING UNIT  
BY CITIES**

		CITIES			
	COUNT COL PCT	MPLS	ST. PAUL	OTHER	ROW TOTAL
B2		1794.	2534.	9998.	
OWN	1.	144	90	551	785
		55.6	67.2	82.9	74.2
RENT	2.	115	44	114	273
		44.4	32.8	17.1	25.8
	COLUMN	259	134	665	1058
	TOTAL	24.5	12.7	62.9	100.0
RAW CHI SQ = 76.30670 WITH 2 D.F., SIG. = .0000					
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 6					

**TABLE TC-2. H2COST2 PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME SPENT ON HOUSING  
BY B2 OWN OR RENT HOUSING UNIT**

		B2		
	COUNT COL PCT	OWN	RENT	ROW TOTAL
H2COST2		1.	2.	
30 OR UNDER	1.	656	190	846
		94.7	75.1	89.4
OVER 30	2.	37	63	100
		5.3	24.9	10.6
	COLUMN	693	253	946
	TOTAL	73.3	26.7	100.0
CORRECTED CHI SQ = 72.96971 1 D.F., SIG. = .0000				
RAW CHI SQ = 75.02476 1 D.F., SIG. = .0000				
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 118				

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

**TABLE TC-3.** B2C EVER RECEIVE LOW-INTEREST GOVERNMENT FIXUP, PURCHASE  
BY MSP MPLS,ST.PAUL,OTHER

		MSP		
COUNT				
COL PCT	OTHER	MPLS, ST.PAUL	ROW TOTAL	
	0	1.		
B2C				
1.	53	51	104	
YES	9.7	21.9	13.3	
2.	495	182	677	
NO	90.3	78.1	86.7	
COLUMN	548	233	781	
TOTAL	70.2	29.8	100.0	
CORRECTED CHI SQ = 20.09395 1 D.F., SIG. = .0000				
RAW CHI SQ = 21.13908 1 D.F., SIG. = .0000				
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 283				

**TABLE TC-4.** B13A RECEIVED ENERGY ASSISTANCE  
BY MSP MPLS,ST.PAUL,OTHER

		MSP		
COUNT				
COL PCT	OTHER	MPLS, ST.PAUL	ROW TOTAL	
	0	1.		
B13A				
1.	10	18	28	
YES	12.5	25.0	18.4	
2.	70	54	124	
NO	87.5	75.0	81.6	
COLUMN	80	72	152	
TOTAL	52.6	47.4	100.0	
CORRECTED CHI SQ = 3.15220 1 D.F., SIG. = .0758				
RAW CHI SQ = 3.94009 1 D.F., SIG. = .0472				
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 912				



# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

**TABLE TC-5. B15 OVERALL RATING OF NEIGHBORHOOD  
BY MSP MPLS,ST.PAUL,OTHER**

COUNT COL PCT		MSP		
		OTHER	MPLS, ST.PAUL	ROW TOTAL
		0	1.	
B15				
	1.	618	244	862
GOOD		92.5	62.2	81.3
	2.	50	148	198
FAIR,POOR		7.5	37.8	18.7
	COLUMN	668	392	1060
	TOTAL	63.0	37.0	100.0
CORRECTED CHI SQ = 147.02646 1 D.F., SIG. = 0				
RAW CHI SQ = 149.01255 1 D.F., SIG. = 0				
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 4				

**TABLE TC-6. B17 IS NEIGHBORHOOD GOOD PLACE FOR CHILDREN  
BY MSP MPLS,STPAUL,OTHER**

COUNT COL PCT		MSP		
		OTHER	MPLS, ST.PAUL	ROW TOTAL
		0	1.	
B17				
	1.	622	270	892
YES		93.4	69.9	84.8
	2.	44	116	160
NO		6.6	30.1	15.2
	COLUMN	666	386	1052
	TOTAL	63.3	36.7	100.0
CORRECTED CHI SQ = 102.34981 1 D.F., SIG. = 0				
RAW CHI SQ = 104.15990 1 D.F., SIG. = 0				
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 12				

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

**TABLE TC-7.** B16 WHAT MOST NEEDED TO IMPROVE NEIGHBORHOOD  
BY B15 OVERALL RATING OF NEIGHBORHOOD

		B15		
COUNT		GOOD	FAIR, POOR	ROW
COL PCT		1.	2.	TOTAL
B16				
1.		70	40	110
APPEARANCE		8.3	20.7	10.6
2.		48	3	51
SCHOOLS		5.7	1.6	4.9
3.		142	21	163
NOISE		16.9	10.9	15.8
4.		11	18	29
HOUSING CO		1.3	9.3	2.8
5.		129	19	148
STRT. MAIN		15.3	9.8	14.3
6.		127	47	174
PUBLIC SAF		15.1	24.4	16.8
7.		314	45	359
SOMETHING		37.3	23.3	34.7
COLUMN		841	193	1034
TOTAL		81.3	18.7	100.0

RAW CHI SQ = 87.94268 WITH 6 D.F., SIG. = .0000

MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 30

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

**TABLE TC-8. B18 MOVING PREFERENCE: SAME, OTHER NEIGHBORHOOD  
BY MSP MPLS,STPAUL,OTHER**

		MSP		
COUNT	COL PCT	OTHER	MPLS, ST.PAUL	ROW TOTAL
		0	1.	
B18				
1.		396	191	587
SAME NEIGH		60.1	49.9	56.3
2.		145	118	263
DIFF. NEIG		22.0	30.8	25.2
3.		118	74	192
SOME OTHER		17.9	19.3	18.4
COLUMN		659	383	1042
TOTAL		63.2	36.8	100.0

RAW CHI SQ = 12.19829 WITH 2 D.F., SIG. = .0022

MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 22

**TABLE TC-9. B23 PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AREA  
BY CITIES**

		CITIES			
COUNT	COL PCT	MPLS	ST. PAUL	OTHER	ROW TOTAL
		1794.	2534.	9998.	
B23					
	-0	0	0	1	1
		0	0	.2	.1
	1.	183	12	29	224
MPLS		71.8	9.0	4.4	21.4
	2.	5	85	15	105
ST.PAUL		2.0	63.4	2.3	10.0
	3.	67	37	614	718
SUBURBS		26.3	27.6	93.2	68.5
	COLUMN	255	134	659	1048
	TOTAL	24.3	12.8	62.9	100.0

RAW CHI SQ = 997.17120 WITH 6 D.F., SIG. = 0

MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 16

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

**TABLE TC-10.** B22A PREVIOUS MINNESOTA RESIDENCE: SAME, OTHER TOWN  
BY MSP MPLS,STPAUL,OTHER

		MSP			
COUNT					
COL	PCT	OTHER	MPLS, ST.PAUL	ROW TOTAL	
		0	1.		
B22A					
	1.	243	276	519	
YES		41.0	80.2	55.4	
	2.	349	68	417	
NO		59.0	19.8	44.6	
	COLUMN	592	344	936	
	TOTAL	63.2	36.8	100.0	
CORRECTED CHI SQ = 133.65619 1 D.F., SIG. = 0					
RAW CHI SQ = 135.23779 1 D.F., SIG. = 0					
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 128					

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

## - - - BREAKDOWN - - -

TABLE TC-11.

CRITERION VARIABLE BROKEN DOWN BY		B6 B2	AMOUNT PAID BY HOUSEHOLD FOR RENT, HOUSE PAYMENT OWN OR RENT HOUSING UNIT		
VARIABLE	CODE	MEAN	STD. DEV.	N	VALUE LABEL
FOR ENTIRE POPULATION		353.424	274.165	947	
B2	1.	354.999	306.578	694	OWN
B2	2.	349.107	153.865	253	RENT
TOTAL CASES =		1064			
MISSING CASES =		117 OR	11.0 PCT.		

TABLE TC-12.

CRITERION VARIABLE BROKEN DOWN BY		B19 B2	LENGTH OF CURRENT-HOUSEHOLD RESIDENCE OWN OR RENT HOUSING UNIT		
VARIABLE	CODE	MEAN	STD. DEV.	N	VALUE LABEL
FOR ENTIRE POPULATION		9.964	10.154	1062	
B2	1.	12.024	10.736	789	OWN
B2	2.	4.011	4.512	273	RENT
TOTAL CASES =		1064			
MISSING CASES =		2 OR	.2 PCT.		

TABLE TC-13.

CRITERION VARIABLE BROKEN DOWN BY		B20 B2	LENGTH OF CURRENT-CITY RESIDENCE OWN OR RENT HOUSING UNIT		
VARIABLE	CODE	MEAN	STD. DEV.	N	VALUE LABEL
FOR ENTIRE POPULATION		20.045	17.780	1060	
B2	1.	21.559	17.240	787	OWN
B2	2.	15.681	18.608	273	RENT
TOTAL CASES =		1064			
MISSING CASES =		4 OR	.4 PCT.		

## APPENDIX C: LI-LIS'84 TABLES

## DIRECTORY

	<u>PAGE</u>
FREQUENCIES	
H COST2 (% OF INCOME SPENT ON HOUSING). . . . .	27
CROWDED (PERSONS PER BEDROOM). . . . .	27
CROSSTABS	
Table LI-1 B2 by CITIES. . . . .	28
Table LI-2 H COST2 by B2. . . . .	28
Table LI-3 H COST2 BY KIDS. . . . .	29
Table LI-4 B5 by KIDS. . . . .	29
Table LI-5 CROWDED by KIDS . . . . .	30
Table LI-6 B2C by MSP. . . . .	30
Table LI-7 B8 by MSP . . . . .	31
Table LI-8 B15 by MSP. . . . .	31
Table LI-9 B17 by MSP. . . . .	32
Table LI-10 B16 by B15 . . . . .	33
Table LI-11 B16 by MSP . . . . .	34
Table LI-12 B18 by MSP . . . . .	35
Table LI-13 B23 by CITIES. . . . .	35
Table LI-14 B22A by MSP. . . . .	36
BREAKDOWN	
Table LI-15 B6 by B2 . . . . .	37
Table LI-16 B19 by B2. . . . .	37
Table LI-17 B20 by B2. . . . .	37

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

## - - - FREQUENCIES - - -

H COST2 PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME SPENT ON HOUSING

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
30 OR UNDER	1.	559	57.9	64.0	64.0
OVER 30	2.	314	32.5	36.0	100.0
	999.	93	9.6	MISSING	
	TOTAL	966	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 873 MISSING CASES 93

CROWDED NUMBER OF PERSONS PER BEDROOM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LESS THAN 1	1.0	217	22.5	22.7	22.7
ONE	2.0	436	45.1	45.7	68.4
BETWEEN 1 & 2	3.0	262	27.1	27.4	95.8
MORE THAN 2	4.0	40	4.1	4.2	100.0
	9.0	11	1.1	MISSING	
	TOTAL	966	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 955 MISSING CASES 11

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

## - - - CROSSTABS - - -

TABLE LI-1. B2 OWN OR RENT HOUSING UNIT  
BY CITIES

		CITIES			
	COUNT COL PCT	MPLS	ST.PAUL	OTHER	ROW TOTAL
B2		1794.	2534.	9998.	
OWN	1.	106	65	181	352
		23.2	36.7	54.7	36.5
RENT	2.	351	112	150	613
		76.8	63.3	45.3	63.5
	COLUMN	457	177	331	965
	TOTAL	47.4	18.3	34.3	100.0
RAW CHI SQ = 82.14678 WITH 2 D.F., SIG. = .0000					
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 1					

TABLE LI-2. HCOST2 PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME SPENT ON HOUSING  
BY B2 OWN OR RENT HOUSING UNIT

		B2		
	COUNT COL PCT	OWN	RENT	ROW TOTAL
HCOST2		1.	2.	
30 OR UNDER	1.	261	298	559
		81.6	53.9	64.0
OVER 30	2.	59	255	314
		18.4	46.1	36.0
	COLUMN	320	553	873
	TOTAL	36.7	63.3	100.0
CORRECTED CHI SQ = 66.21168 1 D.F., SIG. = .0000				
RAW CHI SQ = 67.40795 1 D.F., SIG. = .0000				
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 93				



# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

**TABLE LI-3.** HCOST2 PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME SPENT ON HOUSING  
BY KIDS HOUSEHOLD INCLUDES CHILDREN

COUNT COL PCT	KIDS		ROW TOTAL
	YES	NO	
	1.	2.	
HCOST2			
1.	152	407	559
30 OR UNDER	54.5	68.5	64.0
2.	127	187	314
OVER 30	45.5	31.5	36.0
COLUMN	279	594	873
TOTAL	32.0	68.0	100.0
CORRECTED CHI SQ = 15.64001 1 D.F., SIG. = .0001			
RAW CHI SQ = 16.24382 1 D.F., SIG. = .0001			
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 93			

**TABLE LI-4.** B5 RELATIVE SIZE OF HOUSING UNIT TO HOUSEHOLD  
BY KIDS HOUSEHOLD INCLUDES CHILDREN

COUNT COL PCT	KIDS		ROW TOTAL
	YES	NO	
	1.	2.	
B5			
1.	11	58	69
TOO LARGE	3.7	8.7	7.2
2.	210	527	737
ABOUT RIGHT	70.0	79.4	76.5
3.	79	79	158
TOO SMALL	26.3	11.9	16.4
COLUMN	300	664	964
TOTAL	31.1	68.9	100.0
RAW CHI SQ = 36.06063 WITH 2 D.F., SIG. = .0000			
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 2			

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

**TABLE LI-5. CROWDED NUMBER OF PERSONS PER BEDROOM  
BY KIDS HOUSEHOLD INCLUDES CHILDREN**

COUNT COL PCT	KIDS		ROW TOTAL
	YES	NO	
	1.	2.	
CROWDED			
1.0	20	197	217
LESS THAN	6.7	30.0	22.7
2.0	66	370	436
ONE	22.1	56.3	45.7
3.0	177	85	262
BETWEEN 1	59.4	12.9	27.4
4.0	35	5	40
MORE THAN	11.7	.8	4.2
COLUMN	298	657	955
TOTAL	31.2	68.8	100.0

RAW CHI SQ = 321.63989 WITH 3 D.F., SIG. = 0

MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 11

**TABLE LI-6. B2C EVER RECEIVE LOW-INTEREST GOVERNMENT FIXUP, PURCHASE  
BY MSP MPLS, ST. PAUL, OTHER**

COUNT COL PCT	MSP		ROW TOTAL
	OTHER	MPLS, ST. PAUL	
	0	1.	
B2C			
1.	29	44	73
YES	16.0	25.9	20.8
2.	152	126	278
NO	84.0	74.1	79.2
COLUMN	181	170	351
TOTAL	51.6	48.4	100.0

CORRECTED CHI SQ = 4.59291 1 D.F., SIG. = .0321

RAW CHI SQ = 5.17420 1 D.F., SIG. = .0229

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 615

**TABLE LI-7. B8 RECEIVE RENT ASSISTANCE, SUBSIDIZED HOUSING  
BY MSP MPLS,ST.PAUL,OTHER**

COUNT COL PCT	MSP		
	OTHER 0	MPLS, ST.PAUL 1.	ROW TOTAL
B8			
1.	50	158	208
YES	15.1	25.3	21.8
2.	281	466	747
NO	84.9	74.7	78.2
COLUMN	331	624	955
TOTAL	34.7	65.3	100.0

CORRECTED CHI SQ = 12.65334 1 D.F., SIG. = .0004  
RAW CHI SQ = 13.24614 1 D.F., SIG. = .0003

MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 11

**TABLE LI-8. B15 OVERALL RATING OF NEIGHBORHOOD  
BY MSP MPLS,ST.PAUL,OTHER**

COUNT COL PCT	MSP		
	OTHER 0	MPLS, ST.PAUL 1.	ROW TOTAL
B15			
1.	274	342	616
GOOD	82.5	54.3	64.0
2.	58	288	346
FAIR,POOR	17.5	45.7	36.0
COLUMN	332	630	962
TOTAL	34.5	65.5	100.0

CORRECTED CHI SQ = 74.09020 1 D.F., SIG. = .0000  
RAW CHI SQ = 75.31159 1 D.F., SIG. = .0000

MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 4

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

**TABLE LI-9.** B17 IS NEIGHBORHOOD GOOD PLACE FOR CHILDREN  
BY MSP MPLS,ST.PAUL,OTHER

		MSP		
	COUNT COL PCT	OTHER	MPLS, ST.PAUL	ROW TOTAL
		0	1.	
B17				
YES	1.	278 85.3	349 58.3	627 67.8
NO	2.	48 14.7	250 41.7	298 32.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	326 35.2	599 64.8	925 100.0
CORRECTED CHI SQ = 69.30683 1 D.F., SIG. = .0000				
RAW CHI SQ = 70.53838 1 D.F., SIG. = .0000				
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 41				

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

**TABLE LI-10.** B16 WHAT MOST NEEDED TO IMPROVE NEIGHBORHOOD  
BY B15 OVERALL RATING OF NEIGHBORHOOD

		B15		
COUNT				
COL	PCT	GOOD	FAIR, POOR	ROW TOTAL
		1.	2.	
B16				
1.		45	45	90
APPEARANCE		8.0	14.0	10.1
2.		12	4	16
SCHOOLS		2.1	1.2	1.8
3.		87	35	122
NOISE		15.4	10.9	13.7
4.		26	31	57
HOUSING CO		4.6	9.6	6.4
5.		80	21	101
STRT. MAIN		14.1	6.5	11.4
6.		83	97	180
PUBLIC SAF		14.7	30.1	20.3
7.		233	89	322
SOMETHING		41.2	27.6	36.3
COLUMN		566	322	888
TOTAL		63.7	36.3	100.0

RAW CHI SQ = 64.36919 WITH 6 D.F., SIG. = .0000

MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 78

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

TABLE LI-11. B16 WHAT MOST NEEDED TO IMPROVE NEIGHBORHOOD  
BY MSP MPLS,ST.PAUL,OTHER

COUNT COL PCT	MSP		ROW TOTAL
	OTHER	MPLS, ST.PAUL	
	0	1.	
B16			
1.	24	66	90
APPEARANCE	8.0	11.2	10.1
2.	9	7	16
SCHOOLS	3.0	1.2	1.8
3.	50	72	122
NOISE	16.6	12.2	13.7
4.	7	50	57
HOUSING CO	2.3	8.5	6.4
5.	46	55	101
STRT. MAIN	15.3	9.3	11.3
6.	25	156	181
PUBLIC SAF	8.3	26.4	20.3
7.	140	184	324
SOMETHING	46.5	31.2	36.4
COLUMN	301	590	891
TOTAL	33.8	66.2	100.0

RAW CHI SQ = 71.64415 WITH 6 D.F., SIG. = .0000

MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 75

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

**TABLE LI-12.** B18 MOVING PREFERENCE: SAME, OTHER NEIGHBORHOOD  
BY MSP MPLS, ST. PAUL, OTHER

COUNT COL PCT	MSP		
	OTHER	MPLS, ST. PAUL	ROW TOTAL
	0	1.	
B18			
1.	191	277	468
SAME NEIGH	59.0	45.4	50.1
2.	74	228	302
DIFF. NEIGH	22.8	37.4	32.3
3.	59	105	164
SOME OTHER	18.2	17.2	17.6
COLUMN	324	610	934
TOTAL	34.7	65.3	100.0

RAW CHI SQ = 21.69374 WITH 2 D.F., SIG. = .0000

MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 32

**TABLE LI-13.** B23 PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AREA  
BY CITIES

COUNT COL PCT	CITIES			ROW TOTAL
	MPLS	ST. PAUL	OTHER	
	1794.	2534.	9998.	
B23				
1.	316	12	25	353
MPLS	70.5	7.1	7.7	37.6
2.	8	115	20	143
ST. PAUL	1.8	68.5	6.2	15.2
3.	124	41	278	443
SUBURBS	27.7	24.4	86.1	47.2
COLUMN	448	168	323	939
TOTAL	47.7	17.9	34.4	100.0

RAW CHI SQ = 788.43857 WITH 4 D.F., SIG. = 0

MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 27

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

TABLE LI-14. B22A PREVIOUS MINNESOTA RESIDENCE: SAME, OTHER TOWN  
BY MSP MPLS,ST.PAUL,OTHER

COUNT COL PCT	MSP		ROW TOTAL
	OTHER	MPLS, ST.PAUL	
	0	1.	
B22A			
1.	152	479	631
YES	50.3	83.7	72.2
2.	150	93	243
NO	49.7	16.3	27.8
COLUMN	302	572	874
TOTAL	34.6	65.4	100.0
CORRECTED CHI SQ = 108.25136 1 D.F., SIG. = 0			
RAW CHI SQ = 109.90949 1 D.F., SIG. = 0			
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 92			



# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON HOUSING

## - - - BREAKDOWN - - -

TABLE LI-15.

CRITERION VARIABLE		B6	AMOUNT PAID BY HOUSEHOLD FOR RENT, HOUSE PAYMENT		
BROKEN DOWN BY		B2	OWN OR RENT HOUSING UNIT		
VARIABLE	CODE	MEAN	STD. DEV.	N	VALUE LABEL
FOR ENTIRE POPULATION		232.436	187.138	873	
B2	1.	160.294	217.546	320	OWN
B2	2.	274.183	152.347	553	RENT
TOTAL CASES =		966			
MISSING CASES =		93 OR	9.6 PCT.		

TABLE LI-16.

CRITERION VARIABLE		B19	LENGTH OF CURRENT-HOUSEHOLD RESIDENCE		
BROKEN DOWN BY		B2	OWN OR RENT HOUSING UNIT		
VARIABLE	CODE	MEAN	STD. DEV.	N	VALUE LABEL
FOR ENTIRE POPULATION		9.667	12.165	966	
B2	1.	18.703	14.739	353	OWN
B2	2.	4.463	5.848	613	RENT
TOTAL CASES =		966			

TABLE LI-17

CRITERION VARIABLE		B20	LENGTH OF CURRENT-CITY RESIDENCE		
BROKEN DOWN BY		B2	OWN OR RENT HOUSING UNIT		
VARIABLE	CODE	MEAN	STD. DEV.	N	VALUE LABEL
FOR ENTIRE POPULATION		24.896	21.841	961	
B2	1.	33.977	21.310	349	OWN
B2	2.	19.717	20.419	612	RENT
TOTAL CASES =		966			
MISSING CASES =		5 OR	.5 PCT.		